

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This is in response to the Office Action dated October 15, 2009, and further to the Advisory Action dated December 31, 2009. Claims 1-27 are pending and stand rejected in the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 have been amended.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview granted to Applicant's representative on January 11, 2010.

In the Office Action of October 15, 2009, claims 1-27 were indicated by the Examiner to be allowable if amended to overcome the 112 rejection. For the following reasons, Applicant submits that the above presented claim amendments overcome the 112 rejection, and thus place claims 1-27 in condition for allowance. Hence, it is believed that claims 1-27 are now allowable.

The rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite, is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner referred to the claimed limitation "said difference length calculated by said difference length calculating programmed logic circuitry is reduced by a predetermined ratio of the difference length calculated at the previous interval when said difference length exists", as well as to p. 26, line 24 to p. 27, line 8 of the instant specification, and stated that "The embodiment taught above directly contradicts the claimed feature, where the point-of-regard location is forcedly moved to a location distant by the maximum distance, and not reduced by a predetermined ratio of the difference length calculated", see p. 3 of the Office Action of October 15, 2009.

Amended claim 1 (similarly for the other independent claims) now recites "said difference length calculated by said difference length calculating programmed logic circuitry is reduced by a predetermined ratio of the difference length calculated at the previous interval when

said difference length exists *if the difference length is less or equal than a predetermined maximum value*, regardless of whether the speed of the player character in the game space increases or decreases, wherein said difference length is set at the predetermined maximum value *when said difference length calculated at the previous interval exceeds the predetermined maximum value*". Support for this feature can be found, for example, in p. 26, line 24 to p. 27, line 8 of the instant specification.

With the above amendment, it is made clear that when the calculated difference length exceeds a predetermined value, then the virtual-camera-location updating programmed logic circuitry sets the point-of regard location (determining the location of the virtual camera) at the predetermined maximum distance from the target location; otherwise the relevant distance is reduced by a predetermined ratio of the distance calculated at the previous interval.

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:                     /Leonidas Boutsikaris/                      
Leonidas Boutsikaris  
Reg. No. 61,377

LB:tlm  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4044  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100